

7/3/96  
28 3030 TAF  
Boise, Ida  
83703

Dear Richard Thida,

I have read (skimmed) the copies of your  
Naval Draft - Impact Statement for a Container  
System for the ~~Department~~ Management of  
Naval Spent Nuclear Fuel, including your latest  
Epic: "INDEX".

A  
The one thing that is crystal clear is that  
unbelievable amounts of money have been and  
are being (and will continue to be -) spent to  
convince the American people of the absolute  
necessity for atomic fuel for submarines, weapon  
and atomic energy, etc..

And very little money or effort is being used  
to try phase out this behemoth whose wastes are  
so toxic that no one wants them in their own  
"back yard."

B  
Richard, I thank you for asking very  
kindly what my opinion is, but you and I both  
know very well that mine and the opinions of those  
powerless ones like me mean nothing.  
Sincerely,  
Lois Bradshaw

Commenter: Lois Bradshaw, Idaho

---

Response to Comment:

- A. This EIS explains the need for management of naval spent nuclear fuel which already exists and will require safe management, even if all nuclear energy programs ended immediately. However, the EIS does not discuss the advantages and disadvantages of changing or maintaining the number of nuclear powered warships in operation or to be built. Such matters are directed by Congress and the President fulfilling their responsibilities under the Constitution in providing for the common defense. It would be inappropriate for this EIS to consider what the military force structure of the United States should be. Rather, the EIS analysis supports accomplishment of the Navy's fundamental mission as established by the President and Congress.
- B. The National Environmental Policy Act established a national policy of promoting awareness of the environmental impacts by federal government agencies. All members of the public are able to comment on this EIS. The Navy has provided a large amount of information on the shipment of naval spent nuclear fuel and the types and amounts of radiation or radioactive material involved in releases from normal operations and postulated accidents. The Navy has attempted to provide enough information on the radiation, radioactivity, and other aspects of normal operations or hypothetical accidents to allow independent calculation of environmental impacts. All of this information is intended to permit independent analysis and verification of the estimated impacts calculated by the Navy.

The comments from the public were taken into consideration prior to developing the preferred alternative in the EIS. This is consistent with the Draft EIS, Chapter 3, Section 3.9, which states: "The identification of a preferred alternative in the Final EIS, and the selection of an alternative in the Record of Decision, will take into consideration the following factors: (1) public comments; (2) protection of human health and the environment; (3) cost; (4) technical feasibility; (5) operational efficiency; (6) regulatory impacts; and (7) storage or disposal criteria which may be established for a repository or centralized interim storage site outside the State of Idaho."